

Appl. No. 10/808,721
Amdt. dated November 4, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 5, 2005

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-20 will be pending in this application and presented for examination. Claims 1, 3, and 13 have been amended. Support for the amended claims can be found in the specification. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the interview conducted on November 2, 2005. During the interview, Applicant's attorney discussed with the Examiner about the rejections of claims 1-20 and the Examiner's response to arguments made in the Office Action mailed July 05, 2005. The Examiner suggested Applicant amend the claim limitation "the third voltage is capable of being coupled to anyone of at least the first resistor terminal, the second resistor terminal, and the third resistor terminal" in order to place the application in a better condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections

In the Office Action mailed July 5, 2005, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hodges (U.S. Patent No. 4,200,863) in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,416,485). Applicant respectfully traverses all these rejections.

In response to the Examiner's suggestion, claims 1, 3, and 13 have been amended. For claim 1, claim limitations "wherein the plurality of resistors corresponds to a plurality of resistor terminals, each of the plurality of resistors including two of the plurality of resistor terminals" and "wherein the third voltage is provided by opening or closing a plurality of switches, each of the plurality of switches directly coupled to one of the plurality of resistor terminals" have now been added, replacing the claim limitation "wherein the third voltage is capable of being coupled to anyone of at least the first resistor terminal, the second resistor terminal, and the third resistor terminal". Examples supporting these added claim limitations can be found at least on page 7 of the Specification and Figure 2 of the Drawings.

Appl. No. 10/808,721
Amdt. dated November 4, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 5, 2005

PATENT

Applicant respectfully submits that Hodges and Lee do not, alone or in combination, teach or suggest one or more claim limitations recited in claim 1. For example, Hodges and Lee do not, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a plurality of resistors corresponds to a plurality of resistor terminals, each of the plurality of resistors including two of the plurality of resistor terminals, and a third voltage is provided by opening or closing a plurality of switches, each of the plurality of switches directly coupled to one of the plurality of resistor terminals.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 should be allowed.

Additionally, claims 2-20 are allowable for substantially the same reason as claim 1, and more particularly for the specific features they recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel Mao
Reg. No. 51,995

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
SRB:srb
60616593 v1